

REMARKS

COPY

In the October 27, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-27, and 29-35 pending in the application. This Response amends claims 1, 2, 6, 13, and 21. Support for the amended claims may be found in the originally filed specification, and thus, no new matter is added by this amendment. After entering the foregoing amendments, claims 1-7, 9-27, and 29-35 (3 independent claims; 33 total claims) remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectively requested.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

In the telephone interviews of December 23, 2003, Examiner Baoquoc To, Examiner Corrielus, the Applicant's representative (David O. Caplan), and the Applicant (Karl Forster) discussed the Office Action of October 27, 2003, the cited references from the Office Action, and proposed amendments to the claims. During the interview, proposed amendments to the claims that would overcome the reference cited in the October 27, 2003 Office Action were discussed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS FROM OFFICE ACTION

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because "it is unclear which archive the applicant referrers[sic] to." As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 6 to recite "the generated archive".

Claims 1-7, 9-27, and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Woodhill et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,649,196, issued July 15, 1997 (hereinafter "Woodhill"). Applicants respectively traverse this rejection as discussed with the Examiner during the telephone interview summarized above.

Woodhill generally discloses a system and method for backing up computer files. The backup system will create a copy of files that have changed in order to preserve changes that were made to the files. In contrast to Woodhill, the invention of amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21 will undo changes made to files by replacing files that have changed with a master or archive copy of the file (i.e., a copy of the file without the changes). As discussed with the

Examiner, Woodhill does not disclose each and every element of the invention of amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21. For example, Woodhill does not disclose "generating an archive having an archive file, wherein the archive file comprises a master copy of the target file", "detecting changes to the target file by periodically comparing the target file to the archive file, wherein the comparison comprises comparing one of the contents, size, and date/time of the target file to the corresponding archive file" or "protecting, as necessary, the target file by replacing the target file such that the target file is identical to the archive file, wherein the replacing occurs when the comparison indicates that the target file is not identical to the archive file" as recited by amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21 (emphasis added).

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that the invention of claims 1-7, 9-27, and 29-35 is not anticipated by Woodhill and therefore claims 1-7, 9-27, and 29-35 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-27, and 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

COPY

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited. If the application is not allowed, Applicants respectfully request an Advisory Action from the Examiner. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the form of the claims, then the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

COPY

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

By: _____

David O. Caplan

David O. Caplan

Reg. No. 41,655

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
(602) 382-6284
(602) 382-6070 - Facsimile